

Burke owned Superior Sanitation Services, sold that company to Waste Management, and then founded Atlantic Waste Services in Pooler in 1999.

Although Burke grew up with humble beginnings on his family's dairy farm, he lived a life of immense influence through his involvement with the Chatham Club, the Rotary Club of Savannah, the Savannah Yacht Club, and several other professional organizations.

My thoughts and prayers go out to all who knew him during this most difficult time, especially his son, Ben.

PENNSYLVANIA BENEFITING FROM AID

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Biden signed the American Rescue Plan. Although the bill received no Republican votes, it has bipartisan support and will have a long-lasting bipartisan impact.

Many constituents in my district have already received relief checks, with as many as 90 million stimulus checks out this week.

Yet, this transformative legislation goes even further. It expands funding to get shots in arms and kids safely in school, and it cuts child poverty in half with an expanded child tax credit.

Additionally, we finally targeted relief to our local restaurants and eateries that have been devastated by the pandemic.

Let's not forget about our State and local governments. We will finally be sending them much-needed aid.

My home State of Pennsylvania will receive more than \$13 billion. Montgomery and Berks Counties, where my district resides, will receive a combined \$242 million.

The American Rescue Plan, and all it provides, is the responsible way to fully reopen all of our communities and Build Back Better.

□ 0915

WHOLE MILK FOR HEALTHY KIDS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced the Whole Milk For Healthy Kids Act with Mr. ANTONIO DELGADO. This bill addresses the importance of providing whole milk in school cafeterias.

It is proven that milk is the number one provider of nine essential nutrients, as well as a great deal of long-term health benefits, including better bone health, lower blood pressure, reduced risk of cardiovascular disease and type 2 diabetes. These benefits are crucial for the healthy development of our Nation's youth.

Over the years, milk has been unfairly demonized, leading to the loss of nearly an entire generation of milk drinkers. The goal of this bill is to give children a wide variety of milk options and bolster milk consumption, a win-win for growing healthy children and America's dairy farm families.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to follow the signs and allow whole milk back into the school cafeterias. With bipartisan support, it is my hope that we can bring this bill to the floor and pass this critical legislation to encourage the healthy development of our Nation's youth and support our dairy farm families across the country.

PREVENTING PAYGO SEQUESTRATION

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 233, I call up the bill (H.R. 1868) to prevent across-the-board direct spending cuts, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1868

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PREVENTING PAYGO SEQUESTRATION.

(a) **STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of this Act and the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117-2) shall not be counted on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(b) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be counted on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF MEDICARE SEQUESTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3709(a) of division A of the CARES Act (2 U.S.C. 901a note) is amended by striking “March 31, 2021” and inserting “December 31, 2021”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted as part of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136).

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) **DISREGARD OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR PURPOSES OF MEDICAID AND CHIP.**—Section 2104(h) of the CARES Act (15 U.S.C. 9023(h)) is amended by striking “Federal pandemic unemployment compensation” and inserting “Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation or Mixed Earner Unemployment Compensation”.

(b) **RURAL HEALTH CLINIC PAYMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1833(f)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f(3)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking subclauses (I) and (II) and inserting the following:

“(I) with respect to a rural health clinic that had a per visit payment amount established for services furnished in 2020—

“(aa) the per visit payment amount applicable to such rural health clinic for rural health clinic services furnished in 2020, in-

creased by the percentage increase in the MEI applicable to primary care services furnished as of the first day of 2021; or

“(bb) the limit described in paragraph (2)(A); and

“(II) with respect to a rural health clinic that did not have a per visit payment amount established for services furnished in 2020—

“(aa) the per visit payment amount applicable to such rural health clinic for rural health clinic services furnished in 2021; or

“(bb) the limit described in paragraph (2)(A); and”;

(ii) in clause (ii)(I), by striking “under clause (i)(I)” and inserting “under subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i), as applicable,”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “2019, was” and inserting “2020”;

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting “was” after “(i)”;

(iii) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii)(I) was enrolled under section 1866(j) (including temporary enrollment during the emergency period described in section 1135(g)(1)(B) for such period); or

“(II) submitted an application for enrollment under section 1866(j) (or requested such a temporary enrollment for such period) that was received not later than December 31, 2020.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260).

(c) **ELIGIBILITY FOR REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES.**—Section 306(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 506(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “individuals referred to reemployment services as described in section 303(j)” and inserting “claimants for unemployment compensation, including claimants referred to reemployment services as described in section 303(j).”; and

(2) by striking “such individuals” and inserting “such claimants”.

(d) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR CERTAIN HOSPITALS WITH HIGH DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE.**—Effective as if included in the enactment of section 203(a) of title II of division CC of Public Law 116-260, subsection (g) of section 1923 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-4) amended by such section 203(a) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR CERTAIN HOSPITALS WITH HIGH DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a hospital with high disproportionate share (as defined in subparagraph (B)) located in a State referenced in subsection (e) of section 4721 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, a payment adjustment during a State fiscal year shall be considered consistent with subsection (c) if the payment adjustment does not exceed 175 percent of the costs of furnishing hospital services during the year, but only if the Governor of the State certifies to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the hospital's applicable minimum amount is used for health services during the year. In determining the amount that is used for such services during a year, there shall be excluded any amounts received under the Public Health Service Act, title V, title XVIII, or from third party payors (not including the State plan under this title) that are used for providing such services during the year.

“(B) **HOSPITAL WITH HIGH DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE DEFINED.**—In subparagraph (A), a hospital is a ‘hospital with high disproportionate share’ if—

“(i) the hospital is owned or operated by the State (or by an instrumentality or a unit of government within the State); and

“(ii) the hospital—

“(I) meets the requirement described in subparagraphs (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1); or

“(II) has the largest number of inpatient days attributable to individuals entitled to benefits under the State plan of any hospital in such State for the previous fiscal year.

“(C) APPLICABLE MINIMUM AMOUNT DEFINED.—In subparagraph (A), the ‘applicable minimum amount’ for a hospital for a fiscal year is equal to the difference between the amount of the hospital’s payment adjustment for the fiscal year and the costs to the hospital of furnishing hospital services described in paragraph (1)(A) during the fiscal year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on H.R. 1868.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, because of the American Rescue Plan, relief checks are already being deposited in Americans’ bank accounts, furloughs have already ended for tens of thousands of workers, and we have averted the unemployment cliff. But we have a loose end to tie up before our work is finished, and that is the bill before us.

Enacting COVID relief through budget reconciliation was always plan B, but the American people could not afford any more delays, and Congress needed a path forward for the American Rescue Plan and the transformative support it provides. Because paygo requirements cannot be changed in reconciliation bills, we knew from the outset that this additional legislative fix was needed to avert painful and indiscriminate cuts to Medicare, farm supports, and other programs.

The language of H.R. 1868 should look familiar. Over the past year, Congress has enacted multiple COVID relief packages to address the crises facing the American people and our economy. Each time, we excluded these bills from statutory paygo calculations because of the dire impact sequestration would have on our Nation’s seniors, students, farmers, and others.

Today’s bill will ensure the American Rescue Plan is treated the same as these previous relief measures and

treated the same as the last reconciliation bill passed by Congress. That was in 2017, when Republicans used reconciliation to pass the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Following the bill’s passage without Democratic support in either the House or Senate, Republicans proposed this same legislative fix, albeit buried in a problematic continuing resolution. Enough House and Senate Democrats joined Republicans to prevent harmful across-the-board cuts to critical programs I mentioned, even though we opposed the short-term CR and the massive tax giveaways to the wealthy.

This time the situation is flipped, but the same nonetheless. House Republicans opposed the American Rescue Plan. I don’t understand their position. This bill is supported by more than 70 percent of Americans and will directly benefit far more. But that is the choice they made. Either way, a statutory legislative fix for paygo is now needed and, historically, that has been enacted with little dispute.

Even in the wake of contentious legislation, Congress has come together to prevent sequestration and to protect Medicare, farm support programs, social services, resources for students and individuals with disabilities, and other programs Americans rely on. This time should be no different.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this week, the President has been traveling across the country telling Americans how appreciative they should be that Washington Democrats are spending, or have spent, \$1.9 trillion in borrowed dollars, money they are using to bail out States run by the President’s political buddies and to reward devastating lockdowns that have destroyed hundreds of thousands of small businesses and kept kids out of schools; billions on policies that will reduce private-sector employment in this country; billions on foreign aid.

And out of all the money, less than 9 percent goes towards healthcare spending to crush the virus and to put vaccinations in people’s arms.

The massive debt-inducing spending package also threatens billions in cuts to seniors on Medicare, including \$36 billion starting next year. My guess is that the President is probably not going to be bragging to seniors he meets on the road that the bill he signed into law is cutting billions of dollars from their Medicare, just as I am sure he won’t bother to mention that the economic recovery he wants to take credit for is already underway; that the economy is steadily projected to reach the level of real GDP growth we saw prior to the pandemic by the middle of this year; that we are on track this year, in fact, to have the largest economic growth in more than 15 years, all without one dime used from the nearly \$2 trillion bailout

package that the Democrats passed in the last week.

In other words, just as President Biden has desperately tried to take credit for the incredible, truly historic work President Trump did to ensure that we have vaccines going into the arms to save lives, he is trying to take credit for an economic recovery put in place by the policies signed into law by President Trump. Don’t listen to the words. Watch his actions.

In fact, it was under President Trump’s leadership that Operation Warp Speed delivered multiple vaccines in record time with planning to get those shots in the arms of the American people. Meanwhile, the Biden administration has spent an inordinate amount of time running afoul of fact checkers with their shameless rhetoric meant to dismiss the incredible work done by the previous administration.

Nevertheless, we are here today because Democrats want to fix one of the many problems caused by President Biden and the House Democrats in the \$1.9 trillion bailout: Those cuts to Medicare. And they want to do so by erasing almost \$2 trillion in spending from the Nation’s books; pretending \$2 trillion in spending is not going to happen.

That, of course, serves two purposes for our Democrat colleagues. First, it avoids the immediate cuts, which they caused and they chose to happen. Second, it gives them a clean slate on which they are reportedly already planning to add trillions more in spending in the months to come.

Given all of this, I would ask my colleagues to move forward with a much better approach, one that stops their Medicare cuts and does so in a more responsible way. Let’s work together to protect seniors and to cut waste from their bailout bill that the American people clearly don’t want, such as stopping billions in benefits and payments to prisoners and illegal immigrants—billions in payments to prisoners and illegal immigrants; stopping funds they recklessly jammed into the bailout for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities; stopping special handouts to Federal employees; rescinding billions in bailouts that go to State governments that do not need it, and reward their continued lockdowns.

Mr. Speaker, put people before politics. Put people before politics. Put seniors ahead of the Democrats’ special interests and their political class. This is the responsible way to address the Medicare cuts caused by my Democrat colleagues. It is a far better approach than to simply pretend \$1.9 trillion in spending is not happening. It is a far more honest approach given the fact that the President is traveling the country bragging about the same nearly \$2 trillion in spending.

Mr. Speaker, \$1.9 trillion, such a big number, is hard to put in proper perspective. But this year, when the American people pay their Federal income taxes, every single penny—every

single penny of their hard-earned money the IRS collects will total less than the cost of this \$1.9 trillion bailout to their friends, donors, and political allies.

Let's do the responsible thing: Protect seniors by rolling back some of the most wasteful and wrong policies embedded in the Democrat's bailout bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and also a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1868.

Since the start of the pandemic, Congress has passed several emergency COVID-19 response packages to help our communities get back on their feet. Unfortunately, as the chairman mentioned, due to technicalities in the reconciliation process, some of that progress will be wiped away unless we pass this legislation.

So H.R. 1868 is necessary to prevent the automatic, across-the-board funding cuts that will undermine our recovery. Just as the ranking member mentioned, that will happen unless we pass this bill. Many of those cuts will occur within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor.

For example, the legislation before us protects student borrowers from automatic increases and loan origination fees and would increase the cost of taking out a student loan.

The bill protects TEACH Grants, which help recruit talented individuals into the classroom.

The proposal preserves funding for many of our colleges struggling to survive during the pandemic.

Passing this legislation will prevent cuts to grants that go to students whose parents made the ultimate sacrifice serving our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Finally, this bill protects Americans' access to affordable healthcare during the global health emergency.

Mr. Speaker, Congress took bold action to get our country through the pandemic by enacting the American Rescue Plan. Now we must take this final step in the reconciliation process to ensure that we do not undermine critical programs that students and families urgently need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

□ 0930

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member from Missouri for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1868, the Democrats' attempt to put a Band-Aid on their out-of-control spending, and this bill

tries to remove, as the others speakers have said, the tough consequences of their continued reckless and irresponsible spending.

Last week, the Democrats passed their massive \$2 trillion blue State bailout package with the intent to burden future generations of Americans with yet another layer of crippling debt and inevitably higher taxes for years to come.

This was yet another effort to further use the COVID virus as an opportunity to fund their leftist expansion of government, climate extremism, woke social justice, and radical progressive agenda. At \$2 trillion, the Pelosi bailout bill would spend another \$6,000 per American citizen. This \$6,000 in debt, per citizen, with the chance for some to receive a \$1,400 check, is a raw deal for Americans. Everybody gets an IOU for \$6,000; some people get a \$1,400 check in return.

Only 9 percent of the \$2 trillion is even related to COVID relief, with the bulk of the spending going to fund these Democrat pet projects. There is no pressure at all on the teachers' unions to even reopen the schools in return for the additional \$130 billion in the bill, the Democrats rejected those commonsense amendments to require the schools to reopen. Only 5 percent of that \$130 billion for schools will even be spent this year in 2021, that is how essential it is for COVID relief.

Now Democrats are finally acknowledging today that their spending is out of control and unsustainable, but instead of seeking a true remedy for their problem, they are once again trying to kick the can down the road and exempt their spending from long-standing paygo rules.

This new legislation would prevent sequestration for mandatory spending, which was only triggered in response to the reckless spending bill they passed last week. Their ill-conceived bill failed to cut funding for the unnecessary projects prioritized by Democrats, but not by the American people.

The imminent future sequester cuts this new bill is intended to address came about as a result of the blatantly partisan and irresponsible bill the Democrats rammed through last week. Our national debt is now nearing \$30 trillion, an inconceivable number. It equates to about \$90,000 per citizen. This amounts to an economic crisis, a national security crisis, and we can't afford to ignore it any longer. A day of reckoning is coming.

But the majority is ignoring it. Any semblance of fiscal discipline would have resulted in a COVID bill that was maybe 10 to 20 percent of the \$2 trillion that was in H.R. 1319, the Pelosi blue State bailout. But instead, they unilaterally, on a hyperpartisan basis, rammed through the \$2 trillion to satisfy their left wing, and appease poorly run blue States and Democratic governors.

Our country cannot continue to afford to race toward fiscal insolvency,

and this bill allows the Democrats to put the pedal to the metal without consequence, as we speed faster toward a fiscal catastrophe. Rather than truly helping the country, the bill enables Democrats' fiscal irresponsibility. Actions like this are why Congress has such a low, abysmal approval rating.

I will continue to tell my folks back home that I am fighting for them and their hard-earned tax dollars, while the other side wants to continue to steal those dollars to fund their future pet projects.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves today truly in March madness, and the Democrats are throwing up another air ball with this legislation. I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman from Virginia that in 2017 when Republicans passed an almost identical amount of tax cuts, 83 percent of which went to the top 1 percent and major corporations, MITCH MCCONNELL said on the Senate floor: Sequestration has never happened, will not happen now, and will never happen. His words were prophetic because it is not going to happen today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chair of our Budget Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky. He really makes the point so well.

Look, regardless of what our ranking member says on the other side, America is not in great shape, the economy is not good, many people have lost their jobs, and the reason for the American Rescue Plan was exactly that. We want to help people. We want to make sure people get direct cash payments to help them. We want to make sure the State and local governments get help, because they don't want to be laying people off and not provide services during the pandemic. We want to help small businesses.

The contrast between what we, as Democrats, push in the American Rescue Plan to help people in this economic and health crisis is so vast compared to what the Republicans did with their tax cut, which just helped the wealthiest and helped corporate interest. It is that simple.

So I am just going to ask my colleagues on the other side to put partisanship aside and vote for this bill. This legislation includes non-controversial policies that will truly help all of our constituents. It provides critical support for hospitals and rural health clinics and prevents cuts to Medicare and other important programs.

In recent weeks, Republicans have claimed that any cuts to Medicare would be incredibly harmful. But the only way to make sure that these cuts don't happen is passing this legislation today. In the past, we have always been able to come together to prevent these cuts.

When Republicans passed their \$2 trillion tax law for the wealthiest few, it triggered billions in mandatory cuts, and Congress ultimately voted to prevent those cuts with Democratic support. If Republicans truly want to protect Medicare and other programs that support our farmers, our students, and the Nation's defense, they simply should vote for this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues that in addition to averting statutory paygo cuts, this bill provides additional relief specifically to front-line healthcare providers through increased Medicare payments. This is a policy that Congress supported multiple times. Please support this bill if you care.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind the gentleman from New Jersey that the folks in southeast Missouri, a family of four who makes less than \$55,000 a year, under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act had zero in tax liability because of what the Republicans passed.

I don't think a family of four, who makes \$55,000 or less, is considered the wealthy. But apparently maybe someone from New Jersey might think someone who makes \$55,000 for a family of four is wealthy. It is surely not in southeast Missouri.

I also would like to point out that the gentleman from New Jersey did not help support in waiving this provision back in 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill is just the first taste of a bitter brew concocted by those who pushed through \$1.9 trillion of pure deficit spending last week.

Now, this measure involves our paygo rules. You remember paygo. The current version dates to 2010. In those days everyone was worried about a \$1.3 trillion deficit and \$13 trillion of national debt. Isn't that adorable?

Paygo requires across-the-board spending cuts to offset any bill that spends money we don't have. And we just spent a lot of money we don't have. As paygo works, the first installment payment for this Biden binge is \$345 billion of spending cuts every year for the next 5 years, and that includes \$52 billion in paygo and BCA cuts to Medicare, which is expected to go broke in 2024 as it is. Now, that is just to pay for the party the Democrats had the other day. So it is time to pay for it.

How do you deal with a bill like that? Well, it is pretty simple: Just forget about it. Just wipe it off the books and start planning the next trillion-dollar spending spree. In fairness, that is how both parties have addressed paygo since we passed it. And the net result is the deficit has nearly tripled and the debt has more than doubled in less than a decade.

At least the Republican tax cuts in 2017 helped produce such a strong economic recovery that our revenues went up. They didn't go down. Now, that should have reduced our deficit, but our failure to control spending instead drove that deficit still higher. In short, it is the spending, stupid.

No nation has ever spent, taxed, and borrowed its way to prosperity, but many have spent, taxed, and borrowed themselves into bankruptcy and ruin. History warns us that nations that bankrupt themselves aren't around very long, because before you can provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare, you first have to be able to pay for them.

Excessive debt saps the credit of a nation that is its lifeline in times of genuine peril. It consumes the future prosperity of the nation as interest costs swell. It saps the economic vitality of our Nation by crowding out capital that would otherwise be available to consumers and home buyers and businesses. It robs the currency of its value, pilfering the Nation's savings and their pensions. It alienates capital markets until interest rates rise and interest costs balloon into a debt spiral. Once this starts, there is no way to stop it until the whole house of cards crashes down.

Do you know want to know what that looks like? It looks a lot like Venezuela.

In the spring of 1945, there was serious concern whether we could continue the war into 1946. Bond sales were failing miserably, war taxes, spending, borrowing, and inflation had hollowed out our economy, and the Nation's credit was nearing exhaustion. Now consider this: we are carrying a larger percentage of debt today than we were at the very end of World War II, and I fear how we could respond to a similar sustained national threat today.

When a colleague told the great economist, Adam Smith, that a British defeat would be the ruin of the nation, Smith calmly observed: "Be assured, my young friend, that there is a great deal of ruin in a nation."

But as I look at the unprecedented and unsustainable debt that these policies are producing, I can't avoid a sense of foreboding that our Nation is fast running out of ruin, and that a terrible day of reckoning is coming.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG), a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, last week we passed the American Rescue Plan to help our Nation get through a COVID-19 public health and economic crisis. This historic legislation is already helping millions of Americans and hundreds of thousands of Minnesotans.

When I think about this piece of legislation, it is widely, on a bipartisan basis, supported in a swing district like mine back in Minnesota. But if Congress fails to take action—and we are

not going to let that happen—to prevent sequestration, countless Federal programs that our constituents rely on could be impacted.

If we fail to pass H.R. 1868, cuts to programs at USDA could devastate family farmers who are already reeling after years of trade instability and stupid trade wars. We must act because we cannot allow cuts to Medicare, risking seniors' access to care at a time when they need it the most, in the midst of a deadly global pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this crucial legislation to ensure that the Federal Government can meet the needs of Minnesotans and the American people during a public health crisis. This body that I joined just over 2 years ago; this body has come together numerous times to make sure that we do not allow sequestration to take cuts for worse ideas than helping the American people through a public health crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please support this bill today.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

□ 0945

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, the pandemic was a problem that led some healthcare providers to close their doors. In a bipartisan way, in the previous session of Congress, we made an effort to fix that problem.

Now, because of the Democrats' irresponsible spending bill, healthcare providers who are struggling will see decreased payments, which is the last thing they need right now, and it is the last thing we need right now.

Medicare reimbursement rates are already low, only balanced out by non-Medicare payments. The better way is to target the funding to those who need it and are still working to come out of the pandemic. We can fill the gaps without adding to the deficit.

Wasn't the idea of a rescue to improve access to care? Yet, 9 percent of the \$1.9 trillion really went to address the COVID crisis.

They bailed out failed pension funds without reform and ignored our doctors and healthcare providers on the front lines of the pandemic. They cut payments to caregivers. \$1.9 trillion, yet cuts to healthcare providers during a pandemic.

What Democrats are trying to do today is ignore the negative consequences of the bill they passed earlier this month. The consequences of the bill passed 2 weeks ago means there will be payment cuts to providers.

\$1.9 trillion? Someone should be helped in this measure, but we can do better. We can do better, but we weren't talked to for our ideas.

Mr. Speaker, Members should ask themselves: What about all of this today? Will the next several generations of Americans look to us and say thank you as they get stuck with paying our bills?

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), who is the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important and urgent activity that we are on this morning. Now, my Republican friends talked about this, but they did the identical, same thing in 2017 with President Trump's tax cuts. What is good for my friends is also good for us. That is the way the rules are.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you how devastating the damage would be if we do not act. First of all, it will cut \$29 billion from badly needed programs, and no entity will be impacted and devastated like agriculture. They will cut \$29 billion and cut our programs for energy efficiency and rural development.

We are working on that together. This bill will save our rural development, research, specialty crop development, and beginning and veteran farmer development.

Out of the \$29 billion, it will take \$23 billion out of our Commodity Credit Corporation, limiting our ability to make payments to our farmers and food producers at this critical time when we are in a hunger crisis.

Mr. Speaker, you must understand, we Democrats and Republicans need to send a powerful message to the Nation on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let us move hand in hand together at this serious time.

Now, when my friends used this, it was for the tax cut, most of which went to the wealthy. But this \$23 billion cut to our CCC will devastate the American people where it hurts the most: their food, their water, their shelter, and their clothing. We must not do that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join us.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the body that the reason we are here today is because of the reckless behavior. All of these cuts on Medicare are because House Democrats forced through a nearly \$2 trillion spending bill. The reason we have the paygo statutory provision is because President Obama signed it into law and House Democrats passed it. So the cuts are the result today of all the policies that Democrats have been doing since 2010.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, we are addressing a problem that didn't even exist a week ago. It did not even exist last week.

The Republicans stood on this floor and argued against the \$1.9 trillion par-

tisan package last week. There were many reasons to oppose it, but one of the most significant reasons was the fact that the bill would trigger cuts to Medicare and other essential programs.

We argued that it would harm all of our constituents. I argued that it would harm my constituents in Georgia to my friend, my fellow delegation member. This bill penalized the State of Georgia more than any State in the United States. More than any State in the Nation, Georgia was punished. We lost \$1.3 billion because of the funding formula. We didn't shut down our State, and we didn't destroy our economy, and the funding was based on the unemployment rate and not population.

Where did that \$1.3 billion go? It went to blue States. It went to California, and it went to New York. Georgian taxpayers' money went to other States; it went to blue States.

What did it do to Medicare in the State of Georgia? We lost \$11.5 billion that would have gone to the seniors on Medicare in the State of Georgia.

Where did it go? Again, it went to California, and it went to New York. It went to the blue States. It went to the States that shut down their businesses and destroyed their economies. Yet, the bill was pushed forward anyway.

This could have all been avoided altogether. We could have crafted a bipartisan package that would not have triggered these Medicare cuts. Instead, those across the aisle resorted to forcing a bill through reconciliation. In the end, they passed a package filled with political favors on the back of our seniors.

Again, this could have been avoided. But today, we need to fix this for our constituents who are recognizing we have a spending problem.

Now that the largest stimulus bill in our history has been signed into law, our deficit for the year will also break records. We are now projected to have a Federal deficit of \$3.4 trillion, and debt as a share of our GDP will be at 100 percent for only the second time in our country's history.

My colleagues have shown little regard for actually paying for this reckless spending for political favor. That is why I urge my colleagues to find a way to pay for restoring the cuts to Medicare. The first place I suggest looking for it is in the over 90 percent of the last package that will not go to addressing the pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong, and my colleagues know it is wrong. Let's get this fixed.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), who is a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 1868 to prevent these harmful budget cuts to vital agricultural programs that are relied on by farmers, farmworkers, and food-insecure families in all of our districts.

If we don't pass this bill today, \$29 billion in agricultural funding would be subject to these sequester cuts. Those types of cuts would zero out funding for such crucial agricultural programs like EQIP, the Conservation Stewardship Program, and the Regional Conservation Partnership Program.

In my district on the mid-central coast of California, many farmers, ranchers, and forest landowners rely on those types of helpful programs not just to survive, Mr. Speaker, but to succeed. They use those programs to harvest their products and to be part of the climate solution.

The producers in my district understand and appreciate the old adage called usufruct, which basically says the land they use now must be kept fresh and fertile, not just for them, but for future generations. It is these programs that contribute to their current product and, yes, that type of forward thinking.

Sequester cuts would also prevent the Federal Government from purchasing and donating food to food banks through section 32 purchases. After the year we had, in which food banks contributed so much to the food security of so many of my constituents, we should be doing everything we can to protect and bolster our food programs.

We should also be doing everything we can to protect the production of food, but sequestration cuts would compromise many parts of the farm bill, like the specialty crop block grants or the agricultural research extension programs at public universities.

As the co-chair of the Congressional Agriculture Research Caucus, I know that these types of ag research programs help our farmers meet the challenges of 2021 and will allow them to prepare for challenges of the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, as the Representative from the salad bowl of the world, it is my job to ensure that my farmers, farmworkers, and food-insecure families have all the tools that they need to live and lead healthy and productive lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, as Representatives in Congress for this Nation, it is all of our jobs to ensure that the programs for those tools and that food are here not just for today but tomorrow. We can live up to that responsibility by supporting H.R. 1868.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY), who is the newest member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1868, the bill to prevent across-the-board direct spending cuts.

It should come as no surprise to my Democrat friends. They were told during what little process we had in the \$1.9 trillion spending bill that it was going to disproportionately hurt seniors and that it was going to hurt farmers.

My friends were told this, and they ignored that, knowing they would have to fix it later and drive something just as irresponsible through now.

A disproportionate share of this \$2 trillion goes to urban, poorly run, Democrat cities and States at the expense of our rural, blue-collar Americans who feed, clothe, and protect America every day. We told my friends this weeks ago, and they ignored it.

I am deeply concerned that the Democrats would enact a bill that adds \$1.9 trillion to an American deficit without the support of a single Republican. Over 200 voting Members of this body had no opportunity for input into this massively destructive package.

The Biden administration promised the American people bipartisanship and unity. However, they unilaterally drafted and pushed this bill through without any Republican support.

Now, the Democrats have hastily put together a bill that jeopardizes the standing of our seniors and mortgages the future of our children.

My colleague, Ranking Member SMITH, reminded the Democrats of the consequences of such a dramatic increase in mandatory spending: a \$36 billion cut to Medicare beginning in 2022. Democrats would rather cut benefits to American seniors in rural America than give up checks to illegal immigrants and prisoners.

The Democrats have taken advantage of the need of the American people. My colleagues are advocating for a more responsible alternative that would remove the wasteful spending of the Biden bailout bill and protect the most vulnerable population. We must cut the billions of liberal State bailouts and be sure money already authorized is spent responsibly.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the gentleman from Mississippi, along with all the other Members of this body, that his citizens will receive, in total, \$900 million from just the \$1,400 checks. That is the average that every congressional district is going to receive, and I hope that at some point they will realize the benefits of that injection of capital into an economy that is struggling.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), who is a distinguished member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for his and his committee staff's steady hand over the last couple of months to make sure that the American Rescue Plan was enacted last week.

Mr. Speaker, in that week's time up to today, the American people have

had a chance to listen to the debate and evaluate for themselves what they think of the American Rescue Plan. A Morning Consult poll that came out yesterday showed 72 percent support for the plan, 44 percent among Republicans across the country.

Why not? Ninety million Americans on Wednesday received \$1,400 checks totaling \$242 billion. For those Americans who are not connected digitally to the IRS, they are going to get their checks through the mail.

□ 1000

For those Americans who are filing their 2020 tax returns, whose income now qualifies them for the economic impact payments, they are going to receive their checks.

On Monday, people who were on unemployment got an extension because of the American Rescue Plan. These are working people in the service sectors, in the commercial real estate sector, in most parts of the economy that are still hurting out there.

Every "no" vote was a "no" vote in terms of people getting that critical economic help.

Another vote of confidence happened on Wednesday, which is, the Federal Reserve Board met and voted to keep their key benchmark rate at zero, not just for a couple of weeks or a couple of months, but for the balance of 2021, for all of 2022, and into 2023.

So for all of the historical arguments that we are overheating the economy and inflation is going to go up, Jerome Powell, Donald Trump's nominee as chair of the Federal Reserve, took questions for over an hour on this inflation issue, argued, accurately, with a battalion of economists that they have at the Federal Reserve that there is still slack in this economy and 10 million folks on unemployment need to get this type of fiscal relief that the American Rescue Plan responsibly targeted, which is going to make sure that this country recovers as soon as possible.

This is a routine bill today. We have done it over and over again in the last 10 years. Vote "yes" and make sure that this economy, as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve advised us, gets the help it needs.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), one of the leading doctors of the Republican Conference and a great member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak in opposition to H.R. 1868, but I also feel obligated to point out that you may say that the inflation rate is zero, but if you bought a gallon of gas, purchased a two-by-four at Home Depot, or bought a sack of Quikrete at Lowe's, you would know that inflation is a real phenomenon.

But I do rise in opposition to H.R. 1868. There was no effort made on the

part of the majority party to work with Republicans on what should be a bipartisan priority, and that is provider relief.

I have heard from physicians and I have heard from hospitals in Texas that struggled financially throughout the pandemic. But the bill we have before us today is simply an excuse to wipe out the scorecard of the fiscal impact of this \$1.9 trillion partisan package passed last week.

Last week, Republicans warned that this would threaten cuts to Medicare, but those warnings were repeatedly ignored. If the House majority really cared, if the House Democrats really cared about meaningful healthcare provider relief, they would have worked to gain Republican support, worked with us to build a bill from the ground up. Instead, this bill is coming toward us as a Hail Mary pass right before the Medicare sequester cuts go into effect in April.

As a physician, I have deep empathy for those whose medical practices have been impacted and are now struggling to stay open. I know I have helped many doctors, many clinics, navigate the Provider Relief Fund over this past year. We need targeted relief for the providers who are hurting, and some are hurting more than others.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1999, which is an alternative approach that adds over \$12 billion to the Provider Relief Fund and ensures that dollars would flow to those doctors who have experienced lost revenue or increased cost.

This type of financial relief has already been proven successful. We passed the CARES Act on March 27 of last year. We know it's successful.

Additionally, this alternative bill ensures that the 4 percent cut to Medicare providers that was included in last week's reconciliation bill as a result of statutory paygo does not go into effect in 2022.

The American Rescue Plan Act gifted \$350 billion to State and local governments that simply was not justified. Providers in our State and local communities are worthy of funding and they should specifically benefit from those State and local dollars that are not necessary to go where they are planned to go. That is why we would like to redirect the State and local funding toward provider relief.

Maintaining a strong healthcare workforce is critical to the health of this Nation during normal times, and it is especially critical during a public health emergency.

We should work together on the right policy solution to deliver this relief to ensure that it stands a chance of actually passing in the other body, and that should be a starting point for those discussions.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can come to such a sensible solution.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 1868 to prevent arbitrary cuts to Medicare and to ensure that the American Rescue Plan is treated in the same way as previous coronavirus bills have been treated, including the CARES Act.

This legislation, as we all know, this fix is needed to avoid painful cuts to our mandatory spending programs. And let's remember—the hypocrisy is overwhelming here—that the Democrats voted with Republicans in 2017 to avoid Medicare cuts as a result of the Republican's tax scam, a \$2 trillion tax cut, that went mostly to the wealthy.

Our healthcare workers have been working nonstop for over a year fighting this pandemic. They do not deserve a cut in Medicare payments for taking care of seniors and people with disabilities.

By removing the sequester, we can ensure that providers keep their doors open and they can continue to treat their patients.

Though Republicans voted against the American Rescue Plan, which they shouldn't have, I sincerely hope that today they will join us and vote to protect these programs that enjoy broad bipartisan public support and ensure that our commitment to our Nation's seniors and people with disabilities are met during this public health crisis.

Especially now, we need to be working together, as we did for the Republicans. When the Republicans were giving tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans, we were not going to let Medicare suffer.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentlewoman from Illinois that actions speak louder than words, and that the Democrats did not help the folks in 2017, since the gentlewoman tried to point out the hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, to the gentlewoman's point about working together, Democrats did not offer a hand of bipartisan in this ram-and-jam job on the \$2 trillion bailout bill. They even lost Democrats on it. So they didn't work with us.

It was a pure partisan play, and there is a reason for that. It is mostly unrelated to COVID. It is bailout galore. It is a wish list of the liberals in this House, and they just pushed it through and called it, in disguise, COVID relief.

But the fundamental principle we are talking about today is paygo. This is a law passed by Democrats, signed by a Democrat President. It says, fundamentally—and the American people understand this—if you spend beyond your means, you have got to find a way to pay for it. You have got to offset it or you go into debt.

Mr. Speaker, the American people, if they don't pay their bills, they get their water turned off or their elec-

tricity turned off. The IRS will hunt them down and put them in jail if they don't pay their taxes. They will have their mortgage foreclosed, their cars repossessed. That is what happens to the American people when they don't pay their bills.

President Obama, when he signed the law, said, You can't spend a dollar unless you cut a dollar elsewhere. I agree with him.

Ms. PELOSI, our Speaker, gave a speech and she gave glowing points as she embraced wholeheartedly and full-throatedly this paygo. She said it is important "... to our fiscal soundness, and to our children and grandchildren."

She said: "... who could oppose this great idea?"

She went on to say: "... investments in our children's future ... must be paid for, or else we are heaping debt onto our children."

The national debt is almost \$30 trillion and counting.

Who is going to pay for that?

Not us. Not you. Our kids are going to pay for it.

These are Ms. PELOSI's words, Mr. Speaker: "This pay-as-you-go is part of a blueprint for fiscal responsibility. ..."

She said: "... subjecting spending to the harshest scrutiny. Every Federal dollar that is spent must be subjected to scrutiny to make sure taxpayers get his or her money's worth."

Bailing out union pensions, giving cities and States money that horribly mismanaged their business prior to COVID, giving people more money to be on unemployment than they made in their previous jobs, paying people who are not economically harmed in this COVID disaster, all of these things are wasteful. There is a litany of wasteful, irresponsible, and unnecessary spending, hundreds of billions of dollars.

And the Speaker is saying every dollar is going to be scrutinized. We are going to stick it to our seniors. We are going to stick it to our kids. That is a profile in courage, if I ever saw one. Now, that is the leadership that made this country great, Mr. Speaker. These are Ms. PELOSI's words, not mine, but I agree with her.

We have an opportunity here to do the right thing by our children, to offset the spending here in this \$2 trillion bailout with the wasteful spending that is in there. And I gave you a list, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with you and I plead with my colleagues to offset this and do right by our kids and their future in this country.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentle-

woman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, whenever you hear the words of Speaker PELOSI, you know that the gentlewoman is leading us on the fight to protect our seniors. I am glad to cosponsor this legislation to be a strong supporter of being on the front seat of protecting our seniors.

Whenever you hear us being demagogued from those on the other side using demagoguery, you can be assured that when they pass a tax bill, it was not having seniors as their priority. But when you hear the word "Medicare," you know that Democrats are standing strong to make sure that not one dime is taken away from our seniors with Medicare.

My open letter to my seniors in my district—open message to my seniors is: We will die on the vine to protect your Medicare. That is what we are doing today on the floor of the House. Not one dime will come out of your Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 1868, which excludes the budgetary effects of the American Rescue Plan of 2021 from scorecards established by the Pay-As-You-Go, or PAYGO Act of 2010, preventing across-the-board cuts to numerous direct-spending programs. That is what we are doing here today. We are taking our seniors seriously.

I say to seniors: Have no fear with all of this demagoguery because we are going to make sure that not one dime comes out of your pocket.

In addition, I say to seniors: You are going to be living in cities like Houston, where it says that Houston's share of the stimulus package is \$615 million.

That is going to help keep the city services going, the fire, the police, and trash pickup going. We know that seniors call my office and these issues are important to them.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Houston Chronicle article dated March 10, 2021, showing that the city of Houston will receive \$615 million.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Mar. 10, 2021]

HOUSTON'S SHARE OF STIMULUS BILL EXPECTED TO TOP \$600M, HELP AVOID CUTS TO CITY SERVICES, OFFICIALS SAY

(By Jasper Scherer)

Houston and Harris County are expected to receive more than \$1.5 billion through the stimulus bill approved by Congress Wednesday, providing a massive cash injection that city officials say will help close a budget shortfall widened by the pandemic for the second year in a row.

The measure provides local governments with their most generous round of COVID-related funding yet, and it comes with fewer spending restrictions than last year's aid. Houston will receive an estimated \$615 million, putting the city at more than \$1 billion in direct federal relief during the pandemic, while Harris County is projected to receive \$914 million—more than double its allotment from the first round of local aid last March.

"I'm hopeful and optimistic that we will be able to use this money to, essentially, bail

the city out of a very dire financial situation,” said City Controller Chris Brown, who monitors the spending of Houston’s more than \$5 billion city budget.

Many local governments, including Houston, have seen their sales tax revenues plummet as the pandemic slowed consumer spending on dining, tourism and other leisure activity. And while rising appraisal values mean the city is projected to take in more money from property taxes this year than last, officials say the pandemic’s true toll on property tax revenue may not be felt until early 2022, when homeowners make payments for this year’s not-yet-certified tax rolls.

Much to the relief of local officials, the latest round of federal aid allows cities and counties to spend the funds to replace revenue lost due to the pandemic. Trump administration rules barred local governments from using the first round of local COVID relief to plug budget holes, stipulating it could only cover expenses tied directly to the pandemic, though Mayor Sylvester Turner’s administration still was able to use the funds to avoid furloughing city employees.

Marvin Odum, the former Shell executive appointed by the mayor to oversee the city’s COVID recovery, said Wednesday he is “very optimistic the funds will be able to be used to mitigate the city’s budget shortfalls resulting from COVID-19.” Still, he noted that beyond the broad language in the bill, federal officials have yet to release specific rules for how local governments can spend the funds.

“I’ll just caution that clarity on the guidelines for these programs tends to come over time. It’s not always available immediately,” Odum said.

Republican lawmakers bitterly opposed the local aid, including Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, who accused Democrats of sending “wheelbarrows of cash to state and local bureaucrats to bail out mismanagement from before the pandemic.” Meanwhile, local officials across the country have warned they would have to enact deep cuts to city services, such as fire, police and trash collection, without federal aid to offset their revenue losses.

“Every mayor, every county judge, every local official that I visited with since before December, they all need help,” said U.S. Rep. Sylvia Garcia, D-Houston, a former Houston controller and county commissioner. “Every city in America will get dollars to help with their revenue shortfalls. And that’s huge, because they can keep the firefighters working, they can keep police departments open, they can get the garbage picked up.”

Even before the pandemic, Houston officials in recent years have scrambled to close major city budget gaps, often dipping into reserves to balance spending and revenue. The city’s public safety costs, which make up more than half of spending on core services, have steadily increased as the budget remains capped by a limit on how much property tax revenue the city can take in each year.

“It’s going to solve, in the short term, some of these problems, but the real challenge is, you cannot solve a structural problem with one-time financing sources,” Brown said. “You actually have to do the hard work to cut recurring expenses. And that’s the only way you can narrow that budget gap over time.”

Local governments will receive half their federal aid within 60 days of Friday, when President Joe Biden will sign the bill into law, according to White House press secretary Jen Psaki. They will receive the second half of the funds at least a year later.

That means Houston will receive more than \$300 million to offset its revenue losses

next fiscal year, along with any potential shortfall before the current fiscal year ends June 30. Odum said the city finance department is projecting a budget gap of between \$160 and \$200 million next year, while Brown—whose office generates its own estimates separate from Turner’s administration—said he expects the shortfall to be even higher.

Brown noted that while finance department projections assume the city will see a less-than-1 percent reduction in sales tax revenue this year, the actual decrease has been 7 percent.

“The (Turner) administration, I don’t think, has properly evaluated the reductions in sales and property tax,” Brown said. “There’s a \$40 million variance between us and (the) finance (department) in sales tax alone.”

Brown estimated city officials will have to lay off about a dozen city employees for every \$1 million trimmed from the budget, meaning Houston could have been looking at more than 2,000 layoffs without any federal aid.

Instead, Houston’s relief will far exceed its budget deficit. The city also is expected to devote a chunk of the aid to direct COVID relief, such as testing and vaccinations. Turner’s administration exhausted the previous round of aid, totaling \$405 million, in December. Those funds covered contact tracing efforts, city workers whose jobs were consumed by COVID, and relief to renters and small businesses, among other areas.

Turner, who proposes the annual budget to city council each year, did not respond to questions Wednesday about how he intends to spend the new round of relief aid.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me also indicate that seniors’ healthcare will be in a good place with this particular program. Their grandchildren will be able to go back to school with almost \$1 billion to the Houston Independent School District.

Seniors’ stimulus checks are not going to be ignored. They are going to be able to get stimulus checks directly into their accounts. Their grandchildren, their children will get \$3,600 for a 5-year-old.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, they will get \$3,000 for children above 9 years old. There will be enhanced unemployment for the young people in their lives who have been unemployed. And then, of course, that local restaurant will be able—and I fought for this—to be open again with \$28 billion.

The issue of public assistance or local government assistance was something I was allowed to offer a motion to instruct on. It was something that I thought we could not abandon. We will not abandon seniors. We will not let them touch one dime of Medicare, as our friends on the other side have.

Vote for this legislation because we are seniors first.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary, on Homeland Security, on the Budget, and as the Member of Congress for a congressional district that

has experience the worst of the COVID-19 as a public health emergency and economic catastrophe, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1868, which excludes the budgetary effects of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, from the scorecards established by the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) Act of 2010, preventing across-the-board cuts to numerous direct spending programs.

The legislation also excludes the budgetary effects of this Act from the Senate PAYGO scorecards.

This legislation is necessary to ensure that that Medicare and other programs are protected from PAYGO sequestration.

The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act requires across-the-board cuts, known as “sequestration,” to a defined set of programs if certain legislation affecting mandatory spending or revenues increases net deficits.

Although legislation that Congress designates as an emergency or otherwise excludes from the PAYGO scorecard does not trigger sequestration, this action is necessary because restrictions on the content of reconciliation bills prevented the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 from including a provision to avert sequestration.

The bill before also extends a separate Medicare sequester relief provision, first enacted in the CARES Act, that expires March 31.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has never permitted sequestration to affect the Medicare trust fund and it certainly will not allow it now, just when help is arriving under the American Rescue Plan Act to put shots in arms, money in pockets, kids in school, and workers back on the job.

It is worthwhile to explain why the American Rescue Plan Act is the most transformative legislation in more than a half century and easily justifies exclusion from sequestration.

H.R. 1319, the American Rescue Plan Act, is a landmark, life-saving legislation that will provide urgently-needed resources to defeat the virus, put vaccines in people’s arms, money into families’ pockets, children safely back into classrooms, and people back to work.

With tens of millions of Americans infected, more than half a million lives lost, over 18 million Americans unemployed and millions more hungry and food and housing insecure, thanks to the work of congressional Democrats in the House and Senate and the Biden Administration, at long last the people of the United States and my home state of Texas can be assured that ‘Help Is On The Way.’

In simple terms this life-saving and life-enhancing legislation puts vaccines in arms, puts money in people’s pockets, puts children safely back in school, and it will put workers back in jobs.

1. Put Vaccines in Arms: The plan will mount a national vaccination program that includes setting up community vaccination sites nationwide and addressing disparities facing communities of color. It will also take complementary measures to combat the virus, including scaling up testing and tracing, addressing shortages of personal protective equipment and other critical supplies, investing in high-quality treatments, and addressing health care disparities.

2. Put Money in People’s Pockets: The plan finishes the job on the President’s promise to provide \$2,000 in direct assistance to households across America with checks of \$1,400

per person, following the \$600 down payment enacted in December. The plan will also provide direct housing assistance, nutrition assistance for 40 million Americans, expand access to safe and reliable child care and affordable health care, extend unemployment insurance so that 18 million American workers can pay their bills and support 27 million children with an expanded Child Tax Credit and more than 17 million low-wage workers through an improved Earned Income Tax Credit.

3. Put Children Safely Back in School: The plan delivers \$170 billion for education and \$45 billion for childcare providers. This includes a \$130 billion investment in K–12 school re-opening and making up for lost time in the classroom, with funds that can be used for such things as reducing class sizes, modifying spaces so that students and teachers can socially distance, improving ventilation, implementing more mitigation measures, providing personal protective equipment and providing summer school or other support for students that help make up lost learning time this year. The plan also provides more than \$40 billion for higher education.

Here is what the American Rescue Plan Act means for the State of Texas, Houston, and Harris County.

An estimated \$16.7 billion will come to the State of Texas.

The lion's share of \$3.3 billion will come directly to the City of Houston, and Harris County will receive a similar share of \$5.667 billion, thanks to a provision in the law I helped secure that created the Coronavirus Local Fiscal Recovery Fund and appropriated \$45.57 billion.

\$1.4 billion in direct payments is allocated to smaller jurisdiction like Jacinto City.

Houston Independent School District can expect to receive close to \$100 million (\$993,198 million to be more precise).

The law specifically allows this funding to be used:

1. To respond to the pandemic or its negative economic impacts, including assistance to households, small businesses, and nonprofits, or aid to impacted industries such as tourism, travel, and hospitality;

2. For premium pay to eligible workers performing essential work (as determined by each recipient government) during the pandemic, providing up to \$13 per hour above regular wages;

3. For the provision of government services to the extent of the reduction in revenue due to the pandemic (relative to revenues collected in the most recent full fiscal year); and

4. To make necessary investments in water, sewer, or broadband infrastructure.

In addition to these funds, Texas will receive \$100 million out of the newly created \$10 billion Coronavirus Capital Projects Fund for "critical capital projects directly enabling work, education, and health monitoring, including remote options, in response to the public health emergency with respect to the Coronavirus Disease.

Now all that is well and good but let me tell you what the American Rescue Plan Act means for a hard-working and hard-pressed single mother of two children making a modest income:

Stimulus checks: $\$1,400 \times 3 = \$4,200$

Child tax credit: $\$3,600$ (5-year-old) + $\$3,000$ (9-year-old) = $\$6,600$. Half of that amount will be paid out periodically from late

July through December; the rest will come as a check with next year's taxes.

Enhanced unemployment: If the parent becomes unemployed in March, she will be eligible for \$300 in aid every week through the last week of August.

Total: \$10,800 from stimulus and tax credits, plus another \$7,500 from 25-weeks of enhanced unemployment aid. This individual would also receive \$318 per week in state unemployment aid and thousands more from the Earned Income Tax Credit.

RESTAURANTS

Finally, let me discuss briefly the good things for the restaurant industry that are in the American Rescue Plan Act.

The law allocates \$28 billion in funds to devastated food service establishments, including bars, and food trucks, and vendors.

Unlike the Paycheck Protection Program, which saddled restaurants with burdensome loans if the bulk of the funds were not spent on payroll, these restaurant relief dollars are grants, plain and simple.

Grant sizes will generally be determined by subtracting lower 2020 pandemic-era receipts from higher 2019 gross receipts.

Over \$5 billion will be set aside for smaller venues whose annual gross receipts were below \$500,000, leaving \$23.6 billion for everyone else.

Grants will be capped at \$10 million for restaurant groups and \$5 million for individual venues.

Publicly traded companies or restaurants with more than 20 locations will not be eligible to participate in this funding.

And, for the first 21 days, establishments owned by women, veterans, or economically and socially disadvantaged groups will be prioritized.

This transformative legislation will also provide direct housing assistance, nutrition assistance for 40 million Americans, expand access to safe and reliable child care and affordable health care, extend unemployment insurance so that 18 million American workers can pay their bills and support 27 million children with an expanded Child Tax Credit and more than 17 million low-wage childless workers through an improved Earned Income Tax Credit, which will reduce the number of children living in poverty in America by 50 percent.

I want to commend my colleagues and House Speaker NANCY PELOSI for her leadership and President Biden for signing into law the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, and I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 1868, which excludes the budgetary effects of the American Rescue Plan Act from the scorecards established by the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) Act of 2010, and thus precludes the implementation of direct across the board cuts in spending.

□ 1015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, 55 years ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson overcame sustained Republican opposition to enact Medicare. It has been a literal lifeline for millions. Those who suffered without healthcare before

Medicare now have access to a family physician and hospital care when they need it.

Former Republican Speaker Newt Gingrich, in this very room, plotted to let Medicare wither on the vine. Millions of Americans would have withered had he been successful. Yet, generations of Republicans have sought to privatize it, cut it, or weaken it. Surely, some of the strongest evidence of the success of Medicare, through all of these times, is the claim by today's Republicans that after so many failed attempts to weaken Medicare, they are here, quite amazingly, claiming to be its new protectors.

Of course, this comes following their understandable desperation to justify their inexplicable efforts to deny the relief that was offered by the American Rescue Plan: the survivor benefits; the unemployment; the small business and rental assistance so vitally needed; the support for getting our students back in school, the funding to keep State and local employees doing their jobs. Republicans have resisted that rescue plan with the same fervor that they resisted Medicare in the first place. So determined are these folks to oppose anything that President Biden advances, they have come out here and claimed that the rescue plan means Medicare cuts, which certainly it does not.

Most of Medicare falls within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee, which I chair. We do need to strengthen Medicare. The latest financial report suggests that additional revenues will be needed to sustain Medicare beginning in 2026. Some of the changes that are needed are largely accounting adjustments, and others will require additional revenue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, what our colleagues should be doing is coming together to work with us to ensure the permanent security of Medicare.

Medicare works, but after 55 years, it needs some updates. It has not provided adequate protection against pharmaceutical price gouging; it does not cover most of dental, hearing, and vision care; and, of course, too many Americans are just too young to benefit from Medicare.

I believe we need to be working together to make Medicare better and more widely available to more Americans, because health security is American security.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1868. I know we

have talked this morning about the importance of the bill protecting Medicare. I want to talk with you for a couple of minutes here about its protection of farm supports and other direct spending as it pertains to our family farmers.

As chair of the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, this bill will protect critical resources like the Commodity Credit Corporation, resources that our family farmers depend on now more than ever.

There are nearly 2 million farmers across our Nation. In the district that I serve, we have close to 10,000 family farms. But throughout our Nation, there is no farm that isn't touched by the Commodity Credit Corporation, not one American farmer who wouldn't be impacted by these cuts. In the district I serve, those close to 10,000 family farmers would have fewer resources if this were to happen and would face challenges as they try to pay their bills and put food on the table.

The truth is, our family farmers have seen an onslaught of challenges for years, each year worse than the one before it: extreme weather conditions; devastated crops; unstable and uncertain trade markets that held back exports and economic growth; and throughout the past year, a global pandemic that has left many of our farmers ravaged, even as they kept fighting for fellow Americans, to keep them fed.

COVID-19 has impacted all of us. But, thankfully, we have never truly seen empty store shelves. We have our American farmers to thank for that. We have our American farmers to thank for the stable food supply and for the certainty that, even after years of challenges, even at the height of this worldwide crisis, our American farmers have had our backs. Now, it is time for us to have theirs.

A vote against this bill is a vote to cut farm funding. I urge my colleagues to vote to protect our family farmers and vote "yes" on this critical bill.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have introduced an alternative, a more responsible approach that protects our seniors and rolls back some of the most wasteful and absurd parts of the Democratic bailout bill.

I would encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to put America's seniors ahead of their special interest allies. Join us in finding a solution that protects and respects America's seniors and the working class. We will offer such a solution as a motion to recommit. If adopted, it will instruct the Budget Committee to consider an amendment to make the sensible cuts in waste offered in H.R. 1999, the Protect Seniors and Cut Waste Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amend-

ment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, let's put the healthcare of our seniors ahead of prisoners, illegal immigrants, and the political class.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the last couple of months have been an incredibly busy time. The work that was done on the American Rescue Plan, from start to finish, was extraordinary, and we owe our staffs an enormous debt of gratitude, and not just the Budget Committee staff, but the staff of the 12 committees that also contributed to the drafting of the American Rescue Plan.

I would like to take this time to read the names of the Budget Committee staff who pulled all-nighters, all-weekenders, and went way beyond the call of duty in doing the work on the American Rescue Plan:

Erika Appel, Ellen Balis, Samantha Carter, Edward Etzkorn, Jose Guillen, Jocelyn Harris, Emily King, Sarah Lee, Sheila McDowell, Diana Meredith, Leyla Mocan, Kimberly Overbeek, Barbara Pike, Katie Raymond, Scott Russell, Laura Santos, Raquel Spencer, Greg Waring, Alexandra Weinroth, Christie Wentworth, Jennifer Wheelock, Sam Wice, Ted Zegers, and Grady Stevens. I want to thank all of them personally for their work on behalf of the House.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this: You know, we have heard a lot of newly found concern about the deficit and the debt today. We heard it during the debates. This is the same party that drove up the deficit 3 years ago, 4 years ago now, with a \$2 trillion tax cut, most of which benefitted the wealthiest Americans, and, according to virtually everyone who has looked at it, didn't even come close to paying for itself.

What we have done in the American Rescue Plan is give an incredible boost to the American people, the American people who need the boost most. Not one dollar in the American Rescue Plan goes to the top 1 percent of Americans. The vast majority goes to middle- and lower-income people struggling to get by.

I am kind of amused when people talk about their States being cheated. The gentleman from Georgia talked about how Georgia was cheated. Under the American Rescue Plan, Georgia gets over \$8 billion, twice as much as Georgia got under the CARES Act. That doesn't even count all of the money that is going to the Georgia citizens.

As I said, in every congressional district in this country, on average, the people, the citizens we represent, will

get \$900 million, every congressional district.

My friend from Missouri talked about his family of four. I know his math is better than this, but a family of four doesn't get \$1,400, as he mentioned. A family of four gets \$1,400 times four, which is \$5,600, and then two children, depending on their ages, get at least \$3,000 each. So that family of four is going to get \$11,000 out of this bill.

The talk about future generations, I love that. You know, I am sure that when the national debt reached \$1 billion under Abraham Lincoln, there were people saying: "Wow, we are laying an incredible burden on our grandchildren." When it reached \$1 trillion under Ronald Reagan, I am sure there were people saying the same thing. And when it gets to \$50 trillion, as it probably will in the next couple of decades, people will be saying the same thing.

We have been accumulating debt for our entire history, and yet no one has ever been asked to pay for that debt, and no one ever will.

So all in all, we are very proud of the American Rescue Plan. The American people love the American Rescue Plan. This fix, which we ask for today, is something that, again, is just what the Republicans asked to do in 2017. It is a routine measure. Nobody wants to cut Medicare to providers and certainly benefits to our citizens. I am sure we will have a bipartisan vote on this today, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1868.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Smith of Missouri moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1868 to the Committee on the Budget.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SMITH of Missouri is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protect Seniors and Cut Waste Act".

SEC. 2. PAYGO ACT SEQUESTER.

The budgetary effects of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 shall not be counted for purposes of determining whether a sequester occurs under the report issued after Congress adjourns to end the 1st session of the 117th Congress and during January 2022 under section 5 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

SEC. 3. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES EMERGENCY FUND.

(a) SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION.—There is appropriated, out of any amounts in the

Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for an additional amount for “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund”, \$12,300,000,000, to remain available until expended, to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus, domestically or internationally, which shall be for necessary expenses to reimburse, through grants or other mechanisms, eligible health care providers for health care related expenses or lost revenues that are attributable to coronavirus.

(b) **CONDITIONS.**—The following conditions shall apply with respect to funds appropriated by subsection (a):

(1) Such funds may not be used to reimburse expenses or losses that have been reimbursed from other sources or that other sources are obligated to reimburse.

(2) Recipients of payments under this section shall submit reports and maintain documentation as the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines are needed to ensure compliance with conditions that are imposed by this subsection for such payments, and such reports and documentation shall be in such form, with such content, and in such time as the Secretary may prescribe for such purpose.

(3) The term “eligible health care providers” means public entities, Medicare or Medicaid enrolled suppliers and providers, and such for-profit entities and not-for-profit entities not otherwise described in this paragraph as the Secretary may specify, within the United States (including territories), that provide diagnoses, testing, or care for individuals with possible or actual cases of COVID-19.

(4) The Secretary shall, on a rolling basis, review applications and make payments under this section.

(5) Funds appropriated under this section shall be available for building or construction of temporary structures, leasing of properties, medical supplies and equipment including personal protective equipment and testing supplies, increased workforce and trainings, emergency operation centers, retrofitting facilities, and surge capacity.

(6) In this section, the term “payment” means a pre-payment, prospective payment, or retrospective payment, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(7) Payments under this section shall be made in consideration of the most efficient payment systems practicable to provide emergency payment.

(8) To be eligible for a payment under this section, an eligible health care provider shall submit to the Secretary an application that includes a statement justifying the need of the provider for the payment and the eligible health care provider shall have a valid tax identification number.

(9) For any reimbursement by the Secretary from the Provider Relief Fund to an eligible health care provider that is a subsidiary of a parent organization, the parent organization may, allocate (through transfers or otherwise) all or any portion of such reimbursement among the subsidiary eligible health care providers of the parent organization, including reimbursements referred to by the Secretary as “Targeted Distribution” payments, among subsidiary eligible health care providers of the parent organization, except that responsibility for reporting the reallocated reimbursement shall remain with the original recipient of such reimbursement.

(10) For any reimbursement from the Provider Relief Fund to an eligible health care provider for health care related expenses or lost revenues that are attributable to coronavirus (including reimbursements made before the date of the enactment of this Act), such provider may calculate such lost revenues using the Frequently Asked Questions

guidance released by the Department of Health and Human Services in June 2020, including the difference between such provider’s budgeted and actual revenue budget if such budget had been established and approved prior to March 27, 2020.

(11) Of the amount made available in the third paragraph under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in Public Law 116-136, not less than 85 percent of the unobligated balances available as of the date of enactment of this Act and of any funds recovered from health care providers after the date of enactment of this Act shall be for any successor to the Phase 3 General Distribution allocation to make payments to eligible health care providers based on applications that consider financial losses and changes in operating expenses occurring in fiscal year 2021 that are attributable to coronavirus.

(12) Not later than 3 years after final payments are made under this section, the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall transmit a final report on audit findings with respect to this program to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(13) Nothing in this section limits the authority of the Inspector General or the Comptroller General to conduct audits of interim payments at an earlier date.

(14) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the obligation of funds, including obligations to such eligible health care providers, summarized by State of the payment receipt. Such report shall be updated and submitted to such Committees every 60 days until funds are expended.

(c) **EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.**—

(1) Amounts repurposed in subsection (b) that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(2) The amount appropriated by subsection (a) is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(3) Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

(d) **APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.**—Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and pursuant to title II of Public Law 117-2 shall be subject to the requirements contained in Public Law 116-260 for funds for programs authorized under sections 330 through 340 of the Public Health Service Act.

SEC. 4. CORONAVIRUS STATE FISCAL RECOVERY FUND ADJUSTMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 602 of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “\$219,800,000,000” and inserting “\$79,800,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “\$195,300,000,000” and inserting “\$55,300,000,000”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if

included in the enactment of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) **RURAL HEALTH CLINIC PAYMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1833(f)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(f)(3)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking subclauses (I) and (II) and inserting the following:

“(I) with respect to a rural health clinic that had a per visit payment amount established for services furnished in 2020—

“(aa) the per visit payment amount applicable to such rural health clinic for rural health clinic services furnished in 2020, increased by the percentage increase in the MEI applicable to primary care services furnished as of the first day of 2021; or

“(bb) the limit described in paragraph (2)(A); and

“(II) with respect to a rural health clinic that did not have a per visit payment amount established for services furnished in 2020—

“(aa) the per visit payment amount applicable to such rural health clinic for rural health clinic services furnished in 2021; or

“(bb) the limit described in paragraph (2)(A); and”;

(i) in clause (ii)(I), by striking “under clause (i)(I)” and inserting “under subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i), as applicable,”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “2019, was” and inserting “2020”;

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting “was” after “(i)”; and

(iii) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii)(I) was enrolled under section 1866(j) (including temporary enrollment during the emergency period described in section 1135(g)(1)(B) for such period); or

“(II) submitted an application for enrollment under section 1866(j) (or requested such a temporary enrollment for such period) that was received not later than December 31, 2020.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260).

(b) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR CERTAIN HOSPITALS WITH HIGH DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE.**—Effective as if included in the enactment of section 203(a) of title II of division CC of Public Law 116-260, subsection (g) of section 1923 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-4) amended by such section 203(a) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR CERTAIN HOSPITALS WITH HIGH DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a hospital with high disproportionate share (as defined in subparagraph (B)) located in a State referenced in subsection (e) of section 4721 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, a payment adjustment during a State fiscal year shall be considered consistent with subsection (c) if the payment adjustment does not exceed 175 percent of the costs of furnishing hospital services during the year, but only if the Governor of the State certifies to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the hospital’s applicable minimum amount is used for health services during the year. In determining the amount that is used for such services during a year, there shall be excluded any amounts received under the Public Health Service Act, title V, title XVIII, or from third party payors (not including the State plan under this title) that are used for providing such services during the year.

“(B) HOSPITAL WITH HIGH DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE DEFINED.—In subparagraph (A), a hospital is a ‘hospital with high disproportionate share’ if—

“(i) the hospital is owned or operated by the State (or by an instrumentality or a unit of government within the State); and

“(ii) the hospital—

“(I) meets the requirement described in subparagraphs (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1); or

“(II) has the largest number of inpatient days attributable to individuals entitled to benefits under the State plan of any hospital in such State for the previous fiscal year.

“(C) APPLICABLE MINIMUM AMOUNT DEFINED.—In subparagraph (A), the ‘applicable minimum amount’ for a hospital for a fiscal year is equal to the difference between the amount of the hospital’s payment adjustment for the fiscal year and the costs to the hospital of furnishing hospital services described in paragraph (1)(A) during the fiscal year.”.

SEC. 6. INDIVIDUALS NOT LAWFULLY PRESENT IN UNITED STATES PRECLUDED FROM 2021 RECOVERY REBATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6428B(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2), by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) any individual who was not lawfully present in the United States as of the date of the enactment of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, and”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 9601 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

SEC. 7. INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS PRECLUDED FROM 2021 RECOVERY REBATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6428B(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 and amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3), by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) any individual who was incarcerated on the date of the enactment of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, and”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 9601 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

SEC. 8. REQUIRING A SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER TO RECEIVE COBRA CONTINUATION COVERAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9501(a)(3) of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking at the end “and”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) has been issued a social security number (as defined in section 24(h)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) by the Social Security Administration.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 9501 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

SEC. 9. RESCISSIONS OF AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021 FUNDS.

Of the funds appropriated by the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2), all unobligated funds available under the following provisions of such Act are hereby rescinded:

(1) Section 2021 (relating to the National Endowment for the Arts).

(2) Section 2022 (relating to the National Endowment for the Humanities).

(3) Section 4001 (relating to the Emergency Federal Employee Leave Fund).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 216, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—202

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boehert
Bost
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs

Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Curtis
Davidson
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks

Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NAYS—216

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kabele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schramer
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Brady
Gohmert
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Hoyer
Kinzinger
Lucas
McHenry
Nunes
Roy
Wilson (SC)
Young

□ 1114

Messrs. O'HALLERAN, LEVIN of Michigan, CARSON, and Ms. BASS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CARL and STIVERS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS)) Garbarino (Joyce (OH)) Payne (Pallone) (OH))
 Axne (Stevens) Grijalva (García (IL))
 Barragán (Beyer) Hastings (Butterfield)
 Bera (Aguilar) Kahele (Mrvan) (Joyce (PA))
 Bishop (GA) Kim (NJ) (Davids (KS))
 Blumenauer (Beyer) Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
 Bourdeaux (Clark (MA)) Langevin (Lynch)
 Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries) Lawson (FL) (Evans)
 Buchanan (Gimenez) Lieu (Beyer)
 Bucshon Lowenthal (Beyer)
 Bush (Clark (MA)) McEachin (Wexton)
 Cárdenas (Gomez) Meng (Clark (MA))
 Cleaver (Davids (KS)) Mfume (Brown) (WI)
 DeSaulnier (Beyer) Moore (WI)
 (Matsui) Moulton
 DesJarlais (Underwood)
 (Fleischmann) Napolitano
 Gaetz (Waltz) (Correa)

Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Manning
 Peters (Kildee)
 Matsui
 McBath
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McKinley
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mfume
 Miller-Meeks
 Rush
 Moore (WI)
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mrvan
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Newhouse
 Newman
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Peters

Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Rogers (KY)
 Ross
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Rumpersberger
 Rush
 Ryan
 Salazar
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schradner
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier

Stanton
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Suozzi
 Swalwell
 Takano
 Tenney
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Brady Kinzinger Wilson (SC)
 Gohmert McHenry Young
 Hoyer Nunes

□ 1200

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS)) Garbarino (Joyce (OH)) Moulton (Underwood)
 Axne (Stevens) Gonzalez, Napolitano
 Barragán (Beyer) Vicente (Correa)
 Bera (Aguilar) (Gomez) Payne (Pallone)
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva (García (IL)) Peters (Kildee)
 (Butterfield) Pingree
 Blumenauer Hastings (Cicilline)
 (Beyer) (Butterfield) Porter (Wexton)
 Bourdeaux Kahele (Mrvan) Rodgers (WA)
 (Clark (MA)) Kim (NJ) (Davids (Joyce (PA))
 Boyle, Brendan (KS)) Rush
 F. (Jeffries) Kirkpatrick (Underwood)
 Buchanan (Stanton) Schneider
 (Gimenez) Langevin (Aguilar)
 Bucshon (Lynch) Sires (Pallone)
 (Walorski) Lawson (FL) Slotkin
 Bush (Clark (Evans) (Stevens)
 (MA)) Lieu (Beyer) Smith (WA)
 Cárdenas Lowenthal (Courtney)
 (Gomez) (Beyer) Timmons
 Cleaver (Davids) McEachin (Steube)
 (KS)) (Wexton) Vargas (Correa)
 DeSaulnier Meng (Clark) Wasserman
 (Matsui) (MA)) Schultz (Soto)
 DesJarlais Mfume (Brown) Watson Coleman
 (Fleischmann) Moore (WI) (Pallone)
 Gaetz (Waltz) (Beyer) Williams (GA)
 (Jacobs (CA))
 Wilson (FL)
 (Hayes)

NAYS—175

Aderholt
 Allen
 Amodei
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Babin
 Baird
 Balderson
 Banks
 Barr
 Bentz
 Bice (OK)
 Biggs
 Bishop (NC)
 Boebert
 Bost
 Brooks
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Cammack
 Carl
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Cheney
 Cline
 Cloud
 Clyde
 Cole
 Comer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Curtis
 Davis, Rodney
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donalds
 Duncan
 Emmet
 Estes
 Fallon
 Feenstra
 Ferguson
 Fischbach
 Fitzgerald
 Foxx
 Franklin, C.
 Scott
 Fulcher
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Gibbs
 Gonzales, Tony
 Gonzalez (OH)

Good (VA)
 Gooden (TX)
 Gosar
 Granger
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Greene (GA)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guest
 Guthrie
 Hagedorn
 Harris
 Harshbarger
 Hartzler
 Hern
 Herrell
 Hice (GA)
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill
 Hinson
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Issa
 Jackson
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Keller
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kustoff
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Latta
 LaTurner
 Lesko
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Mace
 Mann
 Massie
 Mast
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClain
 McClintock
 Meijer
 Meuser
 Miller (IL)
 Miller (WV)

Moolenaar
 Mooney
 Moore (AL)
 Moore (UT)
 Mullin
 Murphy (NC)
 Nehls
 Norman
 Obernolte
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Perry
 Pfluger
 Posey
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rose
 Rosendale
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sessions
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smucker
 Spartz
 Steel
 Steil
 Steube
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiffany
 Timmons
 Turner
 Van Duyn
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams (TX)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Zeldin

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—246

Adams Craig Hayes
 Aguilar Crist Herrera Beutler
 Allred Crow Higgins (NY)
 Auchincloss Cuellar Himes
 Axne Davids (KS) Horsford
 Bacon Davidson Houlihan
 Barragán Davis, Danny K.
 Bass Dean Jackson Lee
 Beatty DeFazio Jacobs (CA)
 Bera DeGette Jacobs (NY)
 Bergman DeLauro Jayapal
 Beyer DelBene Jeffries
 Bilirakis Delgado Johnson (GA)
 Bishop (GA) Demings Johnson (TX)
 Blumenauer DeSaulnier Jones
 Blunt Rochester Deuth Kahele
 Bonamici Dingell Kaptur
 Bourdeaux Doggett Katko
 Bowman Keating Kelly (IL)
 Boyle, Brendan F. Khanna
 F. Dunn
 Brown Escobar Kildee
 Eshoo Kilmer
 Brownley Eshoo Kim (CA)
 Buchanan Espaillat Kim (NJ)
 Bush Evans Kind
 Bustos Fitzpatrick Kirkpatrick
 Butterfield Fleischmann Krishnamoorthi
 Carbajal Fletcher Kuster
 Cárdenas Fortenberry Lamb
 Carson Foster Langevin
 Cartwright Frankel, Lois Larsen (WA)
 Case Gallego Larson (CT)
 Casten Garamendi Lawrence
 Castor (FL) Garbarino Lawson (FL)
 Castro (TX) Garcia (CA) Lee (CA)
 Chu Garcia (IL) Lee (NV)
 Cicilline Garcia (TX) Leger Fernandez
 Clark (MA) Gimenez Levin (CA)
 Clarke (NY) Golden Levin (MI)
 Cleaver Gomez Lieu
 Clyburn Gonzalez, Vicente
 Cohen Lofgren
 Connolly Gottheimer Lowenthal
 Cooper Green, Al (TX) Luria
 Correa Grijalva Lynch
 Costa Harder (CA) Malinowski
 Courtney Hastings Malliotakis

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING
THE VICTIMS OF RECENT SHOOT-
INGS IN GEORGIA AND IN SOLI-
DARITY WITH MEMBERS OF THE
AAPI COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks all Members in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, to rise for a moment of silence in honor of the victims of the horrific shootings in Georgia this week and in solidarity with all members of the AAPI community facing discrimination and violence.

CONDEMNING MILITARY COUP IN
BURMA

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 134) condemning the military coup that took place on February 1, 2021, in Burma and the Burmese military detention of civilian leaders, calling for the release of all those detained and for those elected to serve in Parliament to resume their duties, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 14,